

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,708	04/24/2008	T. Randall Lee	96605/28US	9487
23873 7590 04/13/2012 ROBERT W STROZIER, P.L.L.C			EXAMINER	
PO BOX 429 BELLAIRE, TX 77402-0429			CABRAL, ROBERT S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1618	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/13/2012	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Applicant(s) LEE ET AL.
Examiner ROBERT CABRAL	Art Unit 1618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 28 March 2012 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION NO NOTICE OF APPEAL FILED	ON IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.			
The reply was filed after a final rejection. No Notice of Appeal has been one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evides.				
	31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with a not permitted in design applications. The reply must be filed within one of			
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of	the final rejection.			
	ry Action; or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later.			
within 2 months of the mailing date of the final rejection. The curre the prior Advisory Action or SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a), (b FIRST RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S FIRST AFTER-FINA				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date overtension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) this set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) or (c) above, if check mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any ear NOTICE OF APPEAL	n which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The se expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally ted. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the			
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance wind Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CAppeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time perional AMENDMENTS.	CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of			
	No. 100 CON CONTRACTOR OF CONTRACTOR			
 The proposed amendments filed after a final rejection, but prior to They raise new issues that would require further consideration. 				
 a) They have new issues that would require further consideration. b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); 	ion and/or search (see NOTE below),			
c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form	for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for			
appeal; and/or	to appear by materially reducing or employing are leaded to			
 d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. 				
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See a	attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).			
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):				
allowable claim(s).	f submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-			
7. \(\subseteq \) For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): (a) \(\subseteq \) will not be entered, or (b) \(\subseteq \) will be entered, and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	Marian Company and			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after final action, but before or applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	on the date of filling a Notice of Appeal Will <u>not</u> be entered because s why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier			
and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier pres	tions under appeal and/or appellant falls to provide a showing of good ented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NO See Continuation Sheet. 				
 Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/ 	(08) Paper No(s)			
13. Other: STATUS OF CLAIMS				
4. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:				
Claim(s) allowed: .				
Claim(s) objected to:				
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
/Maria Leavitt/	/Robert Cabral/			
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1633	Examiner, Art Unit 1618			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicants have amended claim 1 to limit the scope of the claimed composition and added claims 4.967. New claim 52, for example, which depends from claim 1 recites "wherein the nano-structure has a plamon resonance". None of the claims previously examined recited "wherein the nano-structure has a plamon resonance". This limitation was not previously examined requiring new search and consideration of the art made of record, and of the specification for support of the amendment. Additionally, new claims 4.9, 50, 51 and 53-67 twee not previously examined requiring new search and consideration of the part made of record, and of the specification for support of the amendment.

Continuation of 1.1. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The examiner maintains the rejection of claims 1, 31-39 under 38 U.S.C. 102(a) and (e) as being anticipated by West et al. (WO 01/10558b), for the reasons of record. Additionally, claim 35 remains objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 34. Applicant rebuts the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and (e), in the reply filed on 03-28-2012, by essentially stating that West et al., does not teach the nanostructure deposition on a conductive ore, where the nanostructure such as gold sutifies is conductive as evidenced by the teachings of Ishikawa et al., in fact Applicants argue that the teachings of Ishikawa et al. expressly contradict the teachings of West. That is that Au2S is a delectric. Applicants argue that the teachings of Ishikawa et al., "Structure and electrical properties of Au2S," Solid State Ionics 79 (1995) 60-66 (Generally, whether amaterial is an ionic conductor with high conductivity or not is strongly related to its crystal structure. On this basis the sulfide Au2S could be a gold ion conductor,"). Note that the office reliance on secondary evidence, such as other patents or publications, can be cited to show public possession of the method of making and/or using and is not improper as Applicant attempts to imply. See MPEP 213.10.1.